arXiv:1606.00290v1 [math.LO] 1 Jun 2016

Notes on a reduction property for GLP-algebras

L. Beklemishev*

Steklov Mathematical Institute
Gubkina str. 8, 119991 Moscow, Russia
e-mail: bekl@mi.ras.ru

June 2, 2016

Abstract

We consider some natural generalizations to the class of all GLP-algebras of the so-called reduction property for reflection algebras in arithmetic. An analogue of this property is established for the free GLP-algebras and for some topological GLP-algebras (GLP-spaces).

The notion of GLP-algebra emerged in the study of modal logics describing the behaviour of reflection principles and formalized ω-consistency in Peano arithmetic. From the point of view of modal logic, GLP-algebras are models of polymodal provability logic GLP introduced by G. Japaridze [8, 9]. Central examples of GLP-algebras are reflection algebras associated with formal arithmetical theories T (originally called *graded provability algebras* in [1, 2]) described below.

Σ_n*-reflection formula* for an arithmetical r.e. theory T (containing EA $= I\Delta_0 + \exp$) is a sentence $R_n(T)$, expressing in the language of Peano arithmetic the fact that each T-provable sentence of arithmetical complexity Σ_n is true. Every such formula correctly defines an operation $\langle n\rangle : \mathcal{L}_T \to \mathcal{L}_T$ on the Lindenbaum boolean algebra $\mathcal{L}_T$ of T which associates with the equivalence class of a sentence φ the class of $R_n(T + \varphi)$:

$$\langle n\rangle : [\varphi] \longmapsto [R_n(T + \varphi)].$$

The Lindenbaum algebra of T enriched by all these operations is called the *reflection algebra of* T and is denoted $\mathcal{M}_T = (\mathcal{L}_T, \{\langle n\rangle : n < \omega\})$.

Interesting applications of reflection algebras are connected with the proof-theoretic study of Peano arithmetic PA and, in particular, with the description of the set of theorems of PA of quantifier complexity Π^0_n in terms of a natural system of ordinal notation for the ordinal $\varepsilon_0 = \sup\{\omega, \omega^\omega, \dots\}$.

The reflection algebra of T, in addition to the identities of boolean algebras, satisfies the following principles (where we denote $[n]x := \neg\langle n\rangle\neg x$):

*Research supported by the Russian Science Foundation under grant No. 14–50–00005.

(i) $\langle n\rangle(x \vee y) = (\langle n\rangle x \vee \langle n\rangle y)$;

(ii) $\langle n\rangle 0 = 0$;

(iii) $\langle n\rangle x = \langle n\rangle(x \wedge \neg\langle n\rangle x)$;

(iv) $\langle n\rangle x \leqslant \langle m\rangle x$, for $m \leqslant n$;

(v) $\langle m\rangle x \leqslant [n]\langle m\rangle x$, for $m < n$.

Notice that *Löb's identity* (iii) formalizes a generalization of Gödel's second incompleteness theorem for T.

Definition 1 *GLP-algebra* is a boolean algebra $\mathcal{M}$ enriched by the operations $\langle n\rangle$, for all $n < \omega$, satisfying identities (i)–(v).

Thus, reflection algebras are examples of GLP-algebras. Other examples emerge in the study of scattered topological spaces, in particular, in the study of ordinal topologies [6, 7]. Free GLP-algebras present an independent interest in connection with the study of polymodal provability logic GLP.

The reduction property for reflection algebras is a key fact needed for the proof-theoretic analysis of Peano arithmetic. In [1] this property was formulated using the notion of Π^0_n-conservativity which pertains to formal arithmetic but has no exact correspondent on the abstract algebraic level. In this note we propose some natural analogues of the reduction property that make sense for arbitrary GLP-algebras and establish it for some other classes of GLP-algebras, not necessarily related to formal arithmetic. In particular, we show that the free GLP-algebra enjoys (an analogue of) the reduction property and some topological algebras satisfy some generalizations of it. The first of these results answers a question suggested by Joost Joosten (private communication).

1 Reduction property for GLP-algebras

Recall that theories extending T are associated with the filters of the Lindenbaum algebra $\mathcal{L}_T$. A theory U is called Π^0_n-conservative over a theory V (denoted $V \vdash_{\Pi^0_n} U$) if $U \vdash \pi$ implies $V \vdash \pi$, for all Π^0_n-sentences π. This defines a transitive reflexive relation on the set of filters of $\mathcal{L}_T$. We use the same notation for arbitrary subsets U, V of $\mathcal{L}_T$ when we mean the same relation for the filters generated by these subsets.

Reduction property states that Π^0_{n+1}-consequences of an element of $\mathcal{M}_T$ the form $\langle n+1\rangle\varphi$ (of arithmetical complexity Π^0_{n+2}) can be axiomatized by a sequence of iterated reflection principles $\{Q^k_n(\varphi) : k < \omega\}$, where

$$Q^0_n(\varphi) = \top, \quad Q^k_n(\varphi) = \langle n\rangle(\varphi \wedge Q^k_n(\varphi)).$$

Intuitively, it means that $\langle n+1\rangle\varphi$ is as weak as possible relative to $\langle n\rangle\varphi$ given the constraints of GLP-axioms.

Clearly, for any φ, n, and k, the elements $Q^k_n(\varphi)$ correspond to arithmetical Π^0_{n+1}-sentences and follow from $\langle n+1\rangle\varphi$. The opposite implication only holds in the sense of Π^0_{n+1}-conservativity and under certain assumptions on T.

Theorem 1 (reduction property, [2]) *Suppose T is axiomatized over* EA *by an r.e. set of Π^0_{n+1}-sentences. Then*

$$\{Q^k_n(\varphi) : k < \omega\} \vdash_{\Pi^0_{n+1}} \langle n+1\rangle\varphi.$$

In order to generalize this property to arbitrary GLP-algebras we first introduce some useful notation. For $A \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ define $A \vdash x$, if there are $a_1, \dots, a_k \in A$ such that $a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_k \leqslant x$, in other words, if x belongs to the filter generated by A. Define $A \vdash B$ if $A \vdash x$, for all $x \in B$.

For any sets $A, B \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ define the *$\langle n\rangle$-conservativity relation* $A \vdash_n B$ by:

$$\forall z \in \mathcal{M}\, (B \vdash \langle n\rangle z \Rightarrow A \vdash \langle n\rangle z).$$

We put $A \equiv_n B$ iff $A \vdash_n B$ and $B \vdash_n A$.

Definition 2 A GLP-algebra $\mathcal{M}$ enjoys the *$\langle n\rangle$-reduction property* if, for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$\{Q^k_n(x) : k < \omega\} \vdash_n \langle n+1\rangle x.$$

Since the elements $\langle n\rangle z$ of the algebra $\mathcal{M}_T$, for any $z \in \mathcal{M}_T$, have complexity Π^0_{n+1}, Theorem 1 shows that $\mathcal{M}_T$ enjoys the $\langle n\rangle$-reduction property, for all $n \geqslant m$, provided T is a Π^0_{m+2}-axiomatized extension of EA. On the other hand, the following observation shows that the converse also holds.

Lemma 1 *If $\mathcal{M}_T$ satisfies the $\langle n\rangle$-reduction property then, for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}_T$,*

$$\{Q^k_n(\varphi) : k < \omega\} \vdash_{\Pi^0_{n+1}} \langle n+1\rangle\varphi.$$

Proof. Assume $\pi \in \Pi^0_{n+1}$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}_T$ and $\langle n+1\rangle\varphi \vdash \pi$. Since $\pi \in \Pi^0_{n+1}$ we have $\langle n+1\rangle\top \vdash \pi \to \langle n\rangle\pi$. Hence $\langle n+1\rangle\varphi \vdash \langle n\rangle\pi$. By the $\langle n\rangle$-reduction property we infer $\{Q^k_k(\varphi) : k < \omega\} \vdash \langle n\rangle\pi \vdash \pi$, as required. ⊠

Thus, the abstract reduction property stated in Definition 2 is equivalent to the original one for the class of reflection algebras.

The $\langle n\rangle$-reduction property for a GLP-algebra $\mathcal{M}$ implies an apparently stronger conservation result. Let $\Pi_{n+1}(\mathcal{M})$ denote the closure under $\vee$, $\wedge$ of the following subset of $\mathcal{M}$:

$$\{\top, \bot\} \cup \{\langle k\rangle z : k \leqslant n, z \in \mathcal{M}\} \cup \{[k]z : k < n, z \in \mathcal{M}\}.$$

Notice that these elements always represent Π^0_{n+1}-sentences in $\mathcal{M}_T$. In general, it is not true that $\Pi_{n+1}(\mathcal{M}_T)$ coincides with the set of all equivalence classes of Π^0_{n+1}-sentences in $\mathcal{M}_T$. By the so-called Friedman–Goldfarb–Harrington (FGH) principle, any Π^0_1-sentence below $\langle 0\rangle\top$ is equivalent to a sentence of the form $\langle 0\rangle\varphi$, for some φ. It follows that $\Pi_1(\mathcal{M}_T)$ consists of the equivalence classes of Π^0_1-sentences implying the consistency assertion for T. If T contains the collection schema $B\Sigma_n$, a suitable generalization of the FGH-principle holds for $\langle n\rangle$ in $\mathcal{M}_T$ (see [10]).

Let $A, B \subseteq \mathcal{M}$, define $A \vdash_{\Pi_{n+1}(\mathcal{M})} B$ if $\forall z \in \Pi_{n+1}(\mathcal{M})\, (B \vdash z \Rightarrow A \vdash z)$.

Theorem 2 *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ enjoys the $\langle n\rangle$-reduction property, then for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}$,*

$$\{Q_n^k(\varphi) : k < \omega\} \vdash_{\Pi_{n+1}(\mathcal{M})} \langle n+1\rangle\varphi.$$

We omit the proof. Theorem 2 explains why we have not chosen some apparently larger class of modal formulas to represent Π^0_{n+1}-sentences in Definition 2. Thus, it appears that $\langle n\rangle$-reduction property is the right analogue of the reduction property for the reflection algebras in arithmetic, even though the notion of Π^0_{n+1}-conservativity could be stronger than conservativity for the class of all sentences of the form $\langle n\rangle\varphi$.

2 Reduction property for free GLP-algebras

In this section we assume the familiarity with some notions from [3, 4] and stick to logical rather than algebraic notation. We work with Japaridze's logic GLP and with its fragment J which has nice Kripke semantics and to which GLP is reducible by Theorem 4 of [3].

Our goal is the following theorem.

Theorem 3 *The free GLP-algebra on any number of generators enjoys the $\langle n\rangle$-reduction property, for all n.*

Let $dp(\varphi)$ denote the modal depth of a GLP-formula φ. Let $\sim_n$ denote the n-bisimilarity equivalence relation on a given model. Recall that $\sim_n$ respects the forcing of formulas of modal depth $\leqslant n$, and the number of equivalence classes of $\sim_n$ on any model is bounded by a function of n and the number of variables considered.

The following lemma yields a proof of the theorem.

Lemma 2 *Suppose* GLP $\vdash \langle m+1\rangle\psi \to \langle m\rangle\varphi$. *Then there is a k such that* GLP $\vdash Q_m^k(\psi) \to \langle m\rangle\varphi$. *Moreover, the bound k only depends on $d = \max(dp(\varphi), dp(\psi))$ and the number of variables in φ and ψ.*

Proof. Select a k larger than the number of equivalence classes of $\sim_d$. Assume GLP $\nvdash Q_m^k(\psi) \to \langle m\rangle\varphi$. Let, as in [3] or [4], $M(A)$ denote the conjunction of instances of the monotonicity schema $[i]\theta \to [j]\theta$, for all subformulas $[i]\theta$ of A and all j such that $r \geqslant j > i$, where r is the maximal modality number occurring in A. Further, let $M^+(A) := M(A) \wedge \bigwedge_{i\leqslant r}[i]M(A)$. Obviously, for any formula A, $M^+(A)$ is a theorem of GLP. Hence,

$$\mathrm{J} \nvdash M^+(\langle m+1\rangle\psi \to \langle m\rangle\varphi) \wedge Q_m^k(\psi) \to \langle m\rangle\varphi.$$

Let $\mathcal{W}$ be a rooted J-model of $M^+(\langle m+1\rangle\psi \to \langle m\rangle\varphi) \wedge Q_m^k(\psi) \wedge \neg\langle m\rangle\varphi$. Let 0 denote its hereditary root. Since $\mathcal{W}, 0 \Vdash Q_m^k(\psi)$, there is a sequence of nodes $0R_m a_{k-1} R_m \dots R_m a_0$ such that $\mathcal{W}, a_i \Vdash \psi \wedge Q_m^i(\psi)$, for each $i < k$. By the pigeonhole principle there are $i > j$ such that $a_i \sim_d a_j$.

We denote $a := a_i$ and $a' := a_j$. Let $\mathcal{W}_a$ denote the submodel of $\mathcal{W}$ generated by a, and let α denote the $(m+1)$-plane generated by a. W.l.o.g. we may assume that a is the hereditary root of α, thus

$$\alpha := \{x \in \mathcal{W} : \exists s > m\, aR_s x\} \cup \{a\}.$$

Similarly, let

$$\alpha' := \{x \in \mathcal{W} : \exists s > m\, a'R_s x\} \cup \{a'\}.$$

denote the $(m+1)$-plane generated by a'. Further, let $\mathcal{W}'$ be the minimal J-model obtained from $\mathcal{W}_a$ by adding a new node b such that $bR_{m+1}x$ for all $x \in \alpha$. In particular, $bR_i x$ iff $aR_i x$, for all $i \leqslant m$, and for no x do we have $bR_j x$ if $j > m+1$. Thus, b is the new hereditary root of $\mathcal{W}'$.

We claim that

$$\mathcal{W}', b \nVdash M^+(\langle m+1\rangle\psi \to \langle m\rangle\varphi) \wedge \langle m+1\rangle\psi \to \langle m\rangle\varphi.$$

This yields GLP $\nvdash \langle m+1\rangle\psi \to \langle m\rangle\varphi$, as required.

Clearly, the forcing in $\mathcal{W}_a$ is the same as in the corresponding part of $\mathcal{W}$ and of $\mathcal{W}'$, hence we have $\mathcal{W}_a \vDash M^+(\langle m+1\rangle\psi \to \langle m\rangle\varphi)$, and $\mathcal{W}_a, x \vDash \neg\varphi$, for all x such that $bR_m x$ or $bR_{m+1}x$, whence $\mathcal{W}', b \Vdash [m]\neg\varphi$. Obviously, $\mathcal{W}', b \Vdash \langle m+1\rangle\psi$. This, it remains for us to show that $\mathcal{W}', b \Vdash M(\varphi)$, which is the content of the following lemma.

Lemma 3 *For any subformula $[i]\theta$ of the formula $\langle m+1\rangle\psi \to \langle m\rangle\varphi$ and any $j > i$ there holds $\mathcal{W}', b \Vdash [i]\theta \to [j]\theta$.*

Proof. Recall that $\langle i\rangle\eta$ abbreviates $\neg[i]\neg\eta$, for any formula η. We consider the following cases.

If $[i]\theta = [m]\neg\varphi$ then the only interesting case is $j = m+1$, but we already know that $\mathcal{W}', b \Vdash [m+1]\neg\varphi$.

If $[i]\theta = [m+1]\neg\psi$ then we know that $\mathcal{W}', b \nVdash [m+1]\neg\psi$.

Suppose $[i]\theta$ is a subformula of φ or ψ. We consider the following subcases.

1. If $j > m+1$ then trivially $\mathcal{W}', b \Vdash [j]\theta$.

2. If $j \leqslant m$ we obtain: $\mathcal{W}', b \Vdash [i]\theta$ implies $\mathcal{W}', a \Vdash [i]\theta$, hence $\mathcal{W}, a \Vdash [i]\theta$ and $\mathcal{W}, a \Vdash [j]\theta$, because $\mathcal{W}, a \Vdash [i]\theta \to [j]\theta$. Since $i < j \leqslant m$ this yields $\mathcal{W}', b \Vdash [j]\theta$.

3. If $j = m+1$ and $i < m$ then $\mathcal{W}', b \Vdash [i]\theta$ implies $\mathcal{W}, 0 \Vdash [i]\theta$, hence $\mathcal{W}, 0 \Vdash [m]\theta$. It follows that $\mathcal{W}, x \Vdash \theta$, for each $x \in \alpha$, and therefore $\mathcal{W}', b \Vdash [m+1]\theta$.

4. If $j = m+1$ and $i = m$ we first notice that $dp(\theta) \leqslant d-1$ and, since $a \sim_d a'$, there holds

   $$\forall x \in \alpha\, \exists y \in \alpha'\, x \sim_{d-1} y.$$

   Therefore, $\mathcal{W}', b \Vdash [m]\theta$ implies $\mathcal{W}, y \Vdash \theta$, for each $y \in \alpha'$. Hence, $\mathcal{W}, x \Vdash \theta$, for each $x \in \alpha$. Thus, $\mathcal{W}', b \Vdash [m+1]\theta$.

This proves Lemma 3. ⊠

Lemma 3 together with the previous shows that

$$\mathrm{J} \nvdash M^+(\langle m+1\rangle\psi \to \langle m\rangle\varphi) \wedge \langle m+1\rangle\psi \to \langle m\rangle\varphi.$$

Hence, by Theorem 4 of [3], $\mathrm{GLP} \nvdash \langle m+1\rangle\psi \to \langle m\rangle\varphi$. ⊠

3 Reduction property for GLP-spaces

The following definition comes from [5].

Definition 3 A *GLP-space* is a nonempty set equipped with a sequence of topologies $(X, \{\tau_n : n < \omega\})$ such that $(\mathcal{P}(X), \{d_n : n < \omega\})$ is a GLP-algebra.

Here, d_n denotes the topological derivative operator w.r.t. topology τ_n, that is, $d_n(A)$ is the set of all limit points of a subset A in X. Similarly, c_n will denote the closure operator w.r.t. τ_n.

It is well-known that in a GLP-space, for all $n < \omega$,

1. τ_n is scattered, that is, every non-empty subspace has a isolated point;
2. $\tau_n \subseteq \tau_{n+1}$;
3. For each $A \subseteq X$, $d_n(A)$ is τ_{n+1}-open.

The main example of a GLP-space is the *ordinal GLP-space*, that is, the space $(\Omega, \{\tau_n : n < \omega\})$ where Ω is an ordinal, τ_0 is the left topology and τ_{n+1} is generated by $\tau_n \cup \{d_n(A) : A \subseteq \Omega\}$. We notice that, for each $n < \omega$, τ_n is zero-dimensional, as the sets $d_n(A)$ are clopen in the next topology τ_{n+1}. Also, each τ_n for $n \geqslant 1$ is T_3.

We mention without proof the following characterization.

Proposition 4 *Let $(X, \{\tau_n : n < \omega\})$ be a T_3 GLP-space. For any $A, B \subseteq X$, $A \vdash_n B$ iff ($c_n(A) \subseteq c_n(B)$ or $B \nsubseteq d_n(X)$).*

Topological analogs of the terms $Q^k_n(\varphi)$ are defined as follows, where we generalize to transfinite iterations. Let $A \subseteq X$, α an ordinal, λ a limit ordinal; define:

$$d^0_n[A] = X; \quad d^{\alpha+1}_n[A] = d_n(d^\alpha_n[A] \cap A); \quad d^\lambda_n[A] = \bigcap_{\alpha<\lambda} d^\alpha_n[A].$$

We also note that $d^\alpha_n[X]$ is the familiar Cantor–Bendixson sequence for (X, τ_n). If (X, τ_n) is scattered the sequence $d^\alpha_n[A]$ is a strictly decreasing sequence of τ_n-closed sets, hence we have $d^\alpha_n[A] = \varnothing$, for some α.

Unwinding the definitions we see that a GLP-algebra $(\mathcal{P}(X), \{d_k : k < \omega\})$ satisfies the $\langle n\rangle$-reduction property iff

$$\{d^k_n[A] : k < \omega\} \vdash_n d_{n+1}(A).$$

This is, in general, stronger than saying $d_n^\omega[A] \vdash_n d_{n+1}(A)$. (Consider, for example, the left topology and the interval topology on ω.) However, if (X, τ_{n+1}) is compact then, for all $A, B \subseteq X$ and limit ordinals λ,

$$d_n^\lambda[A] \subseteq d_n(B) \iff \exists \alpha < \lambda \, d_n^\alpha[A] \subseteq d_n(B).$$

Indeed, $X \setminus d_n(B)$ is τ_{n+1}-closed, hence compact, and the left hand side means that $X \setminus d_n^\lambda[A] = \bigcup_{\alpha<\lambda}(X \setminus d_n^\alpha[A])$ is its open cover.

The following more general definition seems to be working well also in the non-compact case.

Definition 4 A GLP-space X satisfies (weak) *α-reduction property for d_n* if, for each subset $A \subseteq X$,

$$d_n^\alpha[A] \vdash_n d_{n+1}(A).$$

If (X, τ_n) is T_3, the weak α-reduction property for d_n is equivalent to the identity $c_n(d_{n+1}(A)) = d_n^\alpha[A]$, for any $A \subseteq X$.

Theorem 4 *The ordinal GLP-space $(\Omega, \{\tau_k : k < \omega\})$ (for Ω sufficiently large) satisfies*

(i) *weak ω-reduction property for d_0;*

(ii) *weak ω_1-reduction property for d_1.*

We conjecture that more generally weak κ-reduction property for d_n holds, where κ is the first limit point of (Ω, τ_{n+1}) (if such a point exists). The existence of limit points for τ_n for $n > 2$ is a large cardinal hypothesis independent of ZFC.

References

[1] L.D. Beklemishev. Provability algebras and proof-theoretic ordinals, I. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 128:103–123, 2004.

[2] L.D. Beklemishev. Reflection principles and provability algebras in formal arithmetic. *Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk*, 60(2):3–78, 2005. In Russian. English translation in: *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 60(2): 197–268, 2005.

[3] L.D. Beklemishev. Kripke semantics for provability logic GLP. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 161:756–774, 2010.

[4] L.D. Beklemishev. A simplified proof of the arithmetical completeness theorem for the provability logic GLP. *Trudy Matematicheskogo Instituta imeni V.A.Steklova*, 274(3):32–40, 2011. English translation: *Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics*, 274(3):25–33, 2011.

[5] L.D. Beklemishev, G. Bezhanishvili, and T. Icard. On topological models of GLP. In R. Schindler, editor, *Ways of Proof Theory*, Ontos Mathematical Logic, pages 133–152. Ontos Verlag, Heusendamm bei Frankfurt, Germany, 2010. Preprint: Logic Group Preprint Series 278, University of Utrecht, August 2009, `http://preprints.phil.uu.nl/lgps/`.

[6] L.D. Beklemishev and D. Gabelaia. Topological completeness of the provability logic GLP. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 164(1–2):1201–1223, 2013.

[7] L.D. Beklemishev and D. Gabelaia. Topological interpretations of provability logic. In G. Bezhanishvili, editor, *Leo Esakia on duality in modal and intuitionistic logics*, Outstanding Contributions to Logic, 4, pages 257–290. Springer, Berlin, 2014.

[8] G.K. Japaridze. The modal logical means of investigation of provability. Thesis in Philosophy, in Russian, Moscow, 1986.

[9] G.K. Japaridze. The polymodal logic of provability. In *Intensional Logics and Logical Structure of Theories: Material from the fourth Soviet–Finnish Symposium on Logic, Telavi, May 20–24, 1985*, pages 16–48. Metsniereba, Tbilisi, 1988. In Russian.

[10] J. Joosten. Turing jumps through provability. Preprint ArXiv:1501.053271v1 [math.LO], 2015.